

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

June 1, 1978
9:00 A.M.

Council Chambers
301 West Second Street

The meeting was called to order with Mayor McClellan presiding.

Roll Call:

Present: Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Himmelblau, Goodman, Snell, Trevino, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen

Absent: None

The invocation was delivered by Reverend Robert Bullock, Assistant Minister of Covenant Presbyterian Church.

NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK

Mayor McClellan read a proclamation designating the week of June 1-7, 1978, as National Safe Boating Week. Accepting the proclamation with their appreciation were Matthew Syptak, Mack A. Stolz, Bernard B. Colley, and A.C. Miller.

RECREATION AND PARKS MONTH

The month of June, 1978, has been designated as Recreation and Parks month, as noted in a resolution passed and signed by members of the City Council. Mayor McClellan read the resolution, which was accepted with appreciation and thanks by acting Director of Parks and Recreation, Michael Segrest.

TELEPHONE EASEMENT RIGHTS

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to authorize execution of certain assignment of easement rights to the General Telephone Company of the Southwest and the Colorado Valley Telephone Cooperative, Inc., in connection with the Fayette Power Project. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

DEED EXECUTION

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to authorize execution of a deed to the State of Texas (State Department of Highways and Public Transportation) conveying .094 of one acre of land out of Lot 2, Laneport Addition, Austin, Travis County, Texas, for the T.A. Brown Elementary School overpass. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

RELEASE OF EASEMENTS

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to authorize release of the following easement:

- a. The west twelve (12.00) feet of a fifty (50.00) foot wastewater and drainage easement along the east portion of Lot 22, Walnut Hills Subdivision, locally known as 6105 Adalee Avenue in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas. (Requested by Mr. Elton Whitaker, owner.)

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to authorize release of the following easement:

- b. A five (5.00) foot Public Utility Easement along the east line of Lot 8, Block F, Bluffington, Section 2, of record in Plat Book 4, Page 329, Travis County Plat records, locally known as 2504 Stratford Drive in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas. (Requested by Mr. George Sanders, Metcalfe Engineering Co., Inc., representing Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Williamson.)

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan

LICENSE AGREEMENT TO PLANT TREES

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to

authorize permission for a license agreement to remove portions of the concrete walk and plant trees in the sidewalk area in front of the property at 417, 419 and 421 East 6th Street, and waive the \$50.00 annual fee, and \$100.00 application fee. (Requested by Jay L. Johnson.) The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

CONTRACTS APPROVED

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

ALEMITE COMPANY	- Lubrication Platform, Vehicle &
5705 Fairlane	Equipment Services Department.
Austin, Texas	Item No. 1 -11 ea. - \$23,400.00

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

Ite Imperial Corp., Subsidiary of	- CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM -
Gould, Inc.	SF6 Gas Circuit Breakers, Electric
303 Jackson Hill	Department.
Houston, Texas	Item 1 - 7 ea. @ \$168,250.00
	Total \$1,177,750.00
	C.I.P. Nos. 77/35-05 & 78/35-01

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

SUMMERS ELECTRIC COMPANY	- Luminaires, Electric Department.
503 East 2nd Street	Items 1 & 2 - \$40,133.75
Austin, Texas	

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

TERRY EDWARDS CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.	- CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM -
11607 North Lamar	Parking Improvements, Parks &
Austin, Texas	Recreation Department Office,
	Butler Park - \$32,137.38
	C.I.P. No. 78/86-17

June 1, 1978

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

COROMETRECS MEDICAL SYSTEMS, INC. Barnes Industrial Park Wallingford, Connecticut	- Fetal Monitoring System, Model 1110 AB or approved equal, as additional monitor for Brackenridge Hospital 2 ea. @ \$6,904.50 Total \$13,809.00
---	---

The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to approve the following contract:

LEIF JOHNSON FORD TRUCK CITY 502 Ben White Boulevard Austin, Texas	- Truck Cab & Chassis, Vehicle & Equipment Services Department - Item HT-28, HT-29, HT-30 - \$337,072.00
--	---

CHILD, INC.

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to change the use of city funds for the FY 1977-78 contract with Child, Inc. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino's second carried by the following vote.

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

GRANT APPLICATION - CETA TITLE III

Councilmember Himmelblau moved that the Council adopt a resolution to submit a grant application to the U.S. Department of Labor of \$130,000 under CETA Title III Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act for the period of September 1, 1978, to February 28, 1980. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

STREET NAME CHANGED

Mayor McClellan introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE NAME OF THAT PORTION OF SUNSTRIP DRIVE WHICH LIES SOUTH OF WILLIAM CANNON DRIVE TO LUNAR DRIVE; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Councilmember Trevino moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Snell, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmember
Cooke
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

ZONING ORDINANCE CHANGE

Mayor McClellan introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND CHANGING THE USE MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:
LOT 1, C.E. BROWN SUBDIVISION, AND A 0.56-ACRE TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 2011-2015 CULLEN AVENUE; FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Councilmember Trevino moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Snell, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmember
Cooke
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

LAND SALE AGENDA ITEM POSTPONED

The Council had before it for consideration the authorization of the sale of city-owned tract of land to adjacent owner, Ralph Moreland Restaurants, subject to limitation regarding access.

.37 of one acre of land out of lot 11, Block A, Partition of the estate of James E. Bouldin.

Mr. Joe Morahan, Director, Property Management, told Council that it was proposed by Ralph Moreland Restaurants to buy this land for additional parking space for their restaurant. Councilmember Himmelblau suggested the city might

lease, but not sell the land, as the city may need it for parking in the future if there is expansion of the Coliseum facilities. She asked that this item be postponed one week in order to find out how many cars could be accommodated on this land if it were used as a parking area by the city.

MEDICAL/PROFESSIONAL OFFICE BUILDING
AT BRACKENRIDGE HOSPITAL

Council had before it a resolution to authorize the issuing of invitations for proposals for a lease of site adjacent to Brackenridge Hospital for a Medical/Professional Office Building.

Mayor McClellan asked for information on the minimum bid amount and what it covers. The amount is \$25,000.00. Mr. Joe Morahan, Director, Property Management, said the minimum bid was in there for the following reasons: 1. To evidence a commitment on the part of the successful proposer to put forth an investment on their part so they could just get the bid, not comply, and back out of it a year later with no penalty or investment on their part. 2. The city construction people feel there should be some inspections made of the construction during the building and the fee would cover some of the staff costs of time to coordinate the approvals and the inspections toward completion of the facility.

Councilmember Goodman pointed out that this particular provision could be waived by the Council when they get down to considering some of the final proposals. He continued that in regard to the time period that is going to be allowed to prospective bidders, he recommends 90 days. He said he thought this would give everyone interested ample time to prepare a proposal.

In answer to Councilmember Trevino's question concerning how many proposals will be sent out, Mr. Morahan replied that 20-25 people have actually asked for proposals, but will send out more than that to people who have not expressed an interest in this project to date.

Mayor Pro Tem Mullen asked how the rental fee of \$3,000.00 per year for the first five years had been determined. Mr. Morahan said this figure was sort of a concession because it was not felt they could charge full market value because of the nature of the site and the city's proposal to get an office building built there. The city did not want to say they would lease it for a dollar a year either, and give up the possibility of someone willing to pay some money. Mr. Morahan said they figured the site size and calculated about what the taxes would be on it at this time, thus coming up with a \$3,000.00 per year tax off-set. It also is an off-set for any administrative costs for administering the lease. Mr. Mullen said that if inflation continues as it is now, it would be to the lessee's advantage. He thought the increases should be pegged to the cost of living rise. After further discussion, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen concluded that he objected to private enterprise being given free property, and Mr. Morahan suggested they escalate the rent on the Consumer Price Index.

Mayor Pro Tem Mullen said that he also wanted some attention paid to the flat amount rate of insurance proposed. That, once again, with inflation, the rates will mean very little in the future. Mr. Morahan said he agrees and said that a provision could be included where the amounts are subject to a review on a periodic basis.

Mr. Goodman commented that when the RFP's are sent out there should be

some flexibility concerning the bid amount, and that generally he is enthusiastic about the project and feels that a long term proposal such as this can only enhance Brackenridge Hospital.

Motion

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution to issue an invitation for proposals for a lease of site adjacent to Brackenridge Hospital for a Medical/Professional Office Building; proposal process to be 90 days; rental will be tied to the Consumer Price Index; and insurance will be subject to review. The motion, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Mullen carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman
Noes: None

OVERLAY PAVEMENT PROBLEMS AT MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

Council had before it a resolution to consider selection of professional services for evaluation of asphaltic concrete overlay pavement problems at Robert Mueller Municipal Airport. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM Nos. 78/81-07 & 78/81-08.

Council also had before it an ordinance amending the 1977-78 Annual Operating Budget to transfer \$15,000 to the Aviation Capital Projects Fund for evaluating of asphaltic concrete overlay problems.

Mayor McClellan said she is concerned with the amount of money, \$15,000.00, it will cost to find out what the city needs to do about the problem with the concrete overlay at the airport. Mr. Al Eldridge, Director, Construction Management, told Council that the renovation will be about a \$400,000 job and there are numerous tests that are required in order to determine just exactly what the nature of the damage is. He said tests were run on the concrete asphalt mix prior to installation, but there is no substitute for sampling in place and on site to check stability and testing of aggregates used. He told Council that the work was begun in November of last year, and because of the difficulty in working in cold weather the temperature had to be 40° or above in order to place the asphalt and concrete. Since the onslaught of hot weather, the stability has proved to be insufficient. The wheels of the bridges and the 727's are sinking down in this after having been in one position for a long time. As a result there is quite a problem and loads cannot be left on the overlays for a very long period of time. Mayor McClellan said she is sure there are some implications here too, and she realizes they have to find out the cause but wondered if the \$15,000 figure is in the "ballpark"? Mr. Eldridge said that it is, considering the magnitude of the cost of construction and the magnitude of the problem. He said the mix is such a delicate thing that they just have to wait to see what the report shows...and that report will be ready soon.

Mr. Davidson, City Manager, commented that in the face of potential litigation it is essential the city have some outside expertise in calculating the testing that is required. This is to determine fault and prove it later.

Councilmember Cooke said he had been told in January or February that the overlay process had been done in other parts of the country and generally it had not worked because the asphalt would be churned up by the heavy aircraft.

He said, "Could I get some kind of indication from staff with regard to, have other airports in the country who have used this asphalt overlay had similar problems and were we aware of that in preparation for using this particular substance?" Mr. Eldridge said that he knew there had been a number of failures around the country and "these same engineers have been involved in the investigation and correction of same. However, so far as the principle involved of making an asphalt overlay over concrete for this purpose, it's widely done and there's not anything inherently incorrect in using an asphalt to concrete overlay. It's just such a sensitive thing... it can't be too harsh and it can't be too unstable." Mr. Eldridge pointed out, after further questioning from Councilmember Cooke, that O'Hare Airport in Chicago has had a similar problem but he is not familiar with the specifics.

Motions

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council adopt a resolution to select the Austin Research Engineers, Inc. for evaluation of asphaltic concrete overlay pavement problems at Robert Mueller Municipal Airport. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM NO.'s 78/81-07 & 78/81-08. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino's second, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau
Noes: None

Mayor McClellan introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 1977-1978 ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET BY TRANSFERRING APPROPRIATED AVIATION OPERATING BUDGET ACCOUNT FUNDS TO THE AVIATION CAPITAL PROJECTS ACCOUNT FUND; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau
Noes: None

AMENDMENT TO HOSPITAL ADVISORY BOARD ORDINANCE

The Council had before it an ordinance to amend the Hospital Advisory Board Ordinance reducing the number of members; revising role and duties. Councilmember Goodman said that Part 3 of the proposed ordinance bothered him. It read as follows:

(e) Before consideration and final approval by the City Council of any matter affecting the operation and administration of Brackenridge Hospital, the board shall have the express power and authority to review such matter and to forward to the City Council the board's recommendation on such matter.

He asked City Attorney Harris, "What happens if they don't review some matter and they don't forward any recommendation to the City Council. I think

we need some clause in there to allow us to act on any matter to meet our responsibilities. I would like an escape clause in there so we can act on a matter in the event the Hospital Board has not met, or if there is a conflict on some question. It is our final responsibility to deal with all these matters." After some discussion, Mr. Harris suggested the following additional wording:

(e) Before consideration and final approval by the City Council of any matter effecting the operation and administration of Brackenridge Hospital, the board shall have the express power and authority to review such matter and to forward to the City Council the board's recommendation on such matter. Nothing herein shall prohibit the City Council from, in the event of an emergency, taking action on any hospital matter without same first reviewed or passed upon by the Hospital Board

Mayor McClellan introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ARTICLE II OF CHAPTER 2 OF THE 1967 CODE OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, REDUCING THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS ON THE HOSPITAL BOARD; PROVIDING FOR TWO YEAR STAGGERED TERMS EXPIRING JULY 1; PROVIDING THAT BEFORE CITY COUNCIL ACTION ON ANY MATTER AFFECTING BRACKENRIDGE HOSPITAL, THE BOARD SHALL REVIEW SUCH MATTER AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THAT ORDINANCES SHALL BE READ ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Motion

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, ~~declare an~~ emergency and finally pass the ordinance. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau
 Noes: Councilmember Cooke
 Abstain; Mayor Pro Tem Mullen

At time of roll call, Councilmember Snell stated, "I vote Yes, but I'd rather it would stay as it is."

Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, at the time of roll call stated: "I'm going to abstain from this vote since I think there is a dispute here. My point is I said I would go along with the Council on what they want to do, having to do with the Board, but I don't think you all know what you want to do on this one so I abstain the vote because I'm against the concept to begin with...of the Hospital Board having authority."

PROPOSAL FOR A COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. R. L. Hancock, Director of the Electric Utility Department, acknowledged consultants present in the Council Chambers, whom he indicated will participate in the submittal and the development of the proposed plan. They were Mr. Marshal Conover, Radian Corporation, Ms. Barbara Parness, Plan Energy, Mr. Bob Morton, Midwest Research and Mr. Chris Wyatt, also of Midwest Research.

Mr. Hancock stated that the City Research and Budget Department has received a Department of Energy RFP about a month ago. He stated that they are expecting responses from interested parties by the 16th of June. Mr. Hancock indicated that this response involved submittal in accordance with Federal guidelines, of a request for a proposal for funding for a comprehensive energy management program. Mr. Hancock stated that the request is for the development of a plan for a very wide based, comprehensive energy management program in the community. He stated that throughout the nation they will probably award some 10-15 of the RFP's. He stated that there were \$3.5 million of available funds and that the Federal government was interested in developing across the country, comprehensive plans which will give a community the ability to manage the energy in that community. Mr. Hancock pointed out that the program is very broad in scope in that it will involve all energy such as transportation, natural gas, petroleum products and electricity. He stated that the Federal government is requesting in the plan, an energy balance in the community such as where does the energy go and from where does it come. He stated that these questions were actually very hard to define once taken into consideration. He said that it would require a great deal of analytical work and community input. Mr. Hancock pointed out that once this audit of the energy balance in the community is developed, the Federal government would expect the plan to develop some issues and some objectives for the comprehensive management program. Upon completion of that it would require the identification and the evaluation of alternative energy conservation strategies for the community. Then finally, a draft comprehensive community energy management plan for implementation and the adoption by the governing body of the community, which would be the Council. This would require an indication of intent on the part of the Council, to implement the plan. Mr. Hancock stated that there may be subsequent funding available for the implementation of the plan.

Mr. Hancock stated that the development of the plan would require a great deal of input from the community, from the consumer as well as the supplier. He stated that they had anticipated an organization in the development of the plan proper, which would probably require four department head level personnel from the City on a 10-15% basis, over the two year scope of the development plan if Austin happened to be successful in the development of the plan. He also stated that it would probably require some 3-4 additional staff people to help supplement the administration and the development of the plan. Mr. Hancock stated that there would be heavy support from consulting firms such as the three firms previously acknowledged, and perhaps some additional firms once the plan was underway and a need for additional expertise arose. He stated that the cost of the plan would probably be somewhere in the order of \$400,000. He stated that this could not really be quantified until a more detailed work plan is developed. He stated that they anticipated some \$300,000 of this cost coming from the grant from the Federal government.

Mr. Hancock felt that the City had a very good chance of receiving the grant. He stated that Austin is in a very unusual position with respect to conservation because Austin has a lot of things that would make it an attractive test area for the program. Mr. Hancock stated that Austin has been very active in the conservation area, is the capitol of the state, has been in a leadership role as far as the development of some conservation plans, and has good citizen input through the development of the goals and the Master Plan as they relate to conservation and through the development of the Citizen's Energy Conservation Commission which has taken some very tangible actions with respect to conservation. He stated that the Federal government has about 800 proposals out and that they expect about 120 proposals in, and from these they will probably award from 10-15 proposals. Mr. Hancock stated that this will be a good

opportunity to develop a comprehensive energy management plan at a minimal cost to the City. He stated that there would be a long-term obligation to the City in the area of implementation. He felt like it would be very likely, however, that there would be some additional funding from the Federal government with respect to implementation. He indicated that the issue at hand is really whether or not the Council wants to proceed in this area, recognizing that they have had to take some unusual actions with respect to the incorporation of consultants, and will probably have to continue with the consultants with the development of the plan if Austin is successful in being awarded the program.

Mayor McClellan felt that the City should most certainly proceed with the proposal, and that energy was the City's number one priority area. Councilmember Cooke asked Mr. Hancock if he saw new, innovative energy conservation techniques coming out of the program. Mr. Hancock indicated that he did because the program would raise the questions as to what can be done to better manage energy. He pointed out some of the questions that could be addressed by the plan. Mr. Hancock felt that solar energy would be one of the things that would need assessing in the areas of strategies and alternatives. He stated that the plan would probably speak to that in generalities and help develop a strategy that might end up in a very detailed assessment. Mr. Hancock pointed out that it was hard to specifically spell out what would be developed in the plan. He stated that they needed to keep in mind that the proposal is primarily a plan on how to manage the system, and the development of strategies and alternatives for that management. Councilmember Cooke hoped that the program would render indications of what City conservation is as opposed to what it would be without the program. City Manager Dan Davidson stated that he recommended this step as an additional means of accomplishing one of the major goals adopted by the City Council.

Motion

Councilmember Cooke moved that the Council approve proceeding with a proposal for a Comprehensive Community Energy Management Program, and to come back with a final document. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Himmelblau, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino
 Noes: None

Mr. Hancock indicated that they would be coming back to the Council with a final document, requesting support of that document by resolution.

FIESTA PLANNED

Councilmember Trevino moved that the Council approve the request of Mr. Edward Rendon, President, East Austin Survival Task, for permission to use Festival Beach (area just west of Fiesta Gardens) for the weekend of June 4, 1978, to have a fiesta, subject to coordination with the Parks & Recreation Department. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Goodman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmembers Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmember Snell
 Noes: None

MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Mr. Monty Nitchoolas, Finance Director, presented the Monthly Financial Statement for the period ending April 30, 1978. (COPY ON FILE IN CITY CLERK'S OFFICE.) Mr. Nitchoolas commented that the March 31st report for the prior six months period was very good, but that this report looks even better. He said that revenues are on budget or better. Councilmember Cooke asked questions about the franchise tax and Mayor Pro Tem Mullen wondered about a report on traffic fine revenue. Mr. Davidson, City Manager, said the report would be sent out shortly. Mr. Cooke asked that, in the future, he would like to see the utility systems revenue included in the highlight letter which accompanies the Financial Statement. He thought it would be particularly interesting to note how it is effected in the summer months.

Mr. Nitchoolas told Council that he has received a Management Letter which is a report submitted by independent auditors concerning the city's Finance Department. The letter indicated the weakness, improvements and strengths of the city system. He said that Council will receive a copy of the letter and will note many critical areas, but that some areas are looked at from a practical point of view. Mr. Nitchoolas wrote a memo to Mr. Davidson which is a brief synopsis of the report. Subjects discussed in the letter are the accounting system, internal audit function, and organization and staff of the Finance Department. He pointed out that these have already been under consideration and study. Mr. Nitchoolas told the Council that the memo they will receive from him will include replies and explanations of points discussed in the Management Letter.

REVIEW OF THE EXISTING ELECTRIC UTILITY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM "PESSIMISTIC" NUCLEAR COST CRITERIA AND "OPTIMISTIC" COAL COST CRITERIA

In response to a question from Councilmember Cooke, Mr. T.L. Hancock, Director of the Electric Utility Department, indicated that the Electric Utility Commission had already been sent a copy of the report. Mr. Hancock made a chart presentation which demonstrated national energy usage, historically from 1960 to present and from 1978 to the year 2000. He pointed out that, currently, domestic oil and gas is producing 19.2 million barrels of equivalent energy per day, imports are 8.1, coal is 6.8, hydro is 1.5 and nuclear is 1. Mr. Hancock stated that, based on historical data of national energy consumption, the nation would use the equivalent of 84 million barrels of oil per day. He stated that it was being recommended that the nation contain its usage of oil to within 56 barrels of oil per day by the year 2000, by means of conservation. It is predicted that domestic oil and gas, in the year 2000, should decline in usage from 19.2 million barrels per day to 13 million barrels per day. This means that the production of domestic oil and gas will have to be about 2/3 of today's level by the year 2000. Mr. Hancock pointed out that since the currently available supplies of natural oil and gas will be depleted by the year 2000, this 2/3 supply will have to come from new resources to be developed in the future. He stated that the country is attempting to achieve a reduction in imports. The national goal is to cut imports in half from about 8 million to 4 million. Mr. Hancock stated that the country is striving to increase the usage of coal from 6.8 million barrels of equivalent energy per day to 19 million in the year 2000. This would mean a tripling of the coal production in the nation. Mr. Hancock stated that by the year 2000, the nation's use of hydro-electric energy would probably be about the same or closer to 2 million and the remainder of energy needs will have to come from solar, geothermal, waste recycling and light water reactors. In response to a question from Councilmember Goodman, Mr. Hancock stated that light water reactors were not being utilized at the rate being projected. He also stated that the nation would have to reduce its oil imports in order to reach the 56 million barrel per day goal. Mr. Hancock

pointed out that there are many obstacles which are connected with coal production.

Mr. Hancock then gave a historical summary of the energy situation in Austin. He stated that from 1962-72 Austin was on about a 12.6% compound energy growth rate, which means a doubling every 5-6 years in energy required. In 1972 there was a concerted effort to stimulate conservation of energy. Between 1972-76 there was an economic recession period during which there was a reduction in building and growth in the community and the compound growth rate over that period for energy was at a 4% rate. Mr. Hancock stated that Austin's electric consumption level today is about 78% of what it would have been under the old growth rate criteria, this indicates that Austin has conserved 21% energy wise. He stated that the growth rate during the adjustment period was at 4% and the projections used in the study were at about a 6.1% growth rate. Mr. Hancock pointed out that the 6.1% figure may be a bit too low in light of the increased demands being made upon the electric generating system. Councilmember Cooke asked Mr. Hancock if the Electric Utility Department had any anticipation of what Austin's peak loading might be for the summer. He stated that their official projection is about a 3% growth rate this year and a 3% growth rate next year. Mr. Hancock indicated that under the present plan the city will be 300MW short in 1995. He said that 1992 seems to be an adequate period which gives enough lead time to respond.

Mr. Hancock indicated that the South Texas Nuclear Plant cost is now estimated by engineers to be \$208 million for Austin's portion upon completion of the facility. He stated that the projected pessimistic cost increase came out to be about a 30% increase in project cost or about \$245 million. Councilmember Goodman asked if either cost project included the amount of interest that the City will be paying on the bonds. Mr. Hancock stated that neither projection took into consideration interest payment on bonds. He stated that earlier studies priced uranium at \$50/lb. in 1980, whereas the pessimistic study placed uranium at \$75/lb. He stated that the City has a commitment with Chevron Oil Company for the first five years on the order of \$40-42/lb. for uranium. Mr. Hancock stated that the capacity factor for STP was based on a 67% average capacity factor which is the cumulative life time average of a pressurized water reactor through 1976. He stated that in the pessimistic case, this figure was reduced to a 59% capacity factor. Mr. Hancock pointed out that Austin's portion of the Fayette Project is \$215 million. He made mention of the I.C.C. decision rendered Houston Lighting and Power which set coal delivery at \$15.60 per ton. Mr. Hancock stated that the cost of coal under the Decker contract is \$14 per ton as of April 1, 1978, based on the latest available escalation indices. The cost of coal under the ARCO contract is \$7.65 per ton based on the latest available indices and the United Mine Workers contract settlement.

Mr. Hancock stated that under the economic studies they do present worth studies and cumulative cost studies. He stated that present worth takes into consideration the time value of money and allow the study to run theoretically for the lack of a plant as opposed to the 15 year period, but they relate only to generation cost. The four plans looked at were, first, the base plan which is 550MW at Fayette and 400MW at STP, and set that as the base case at zero. Under the present worth studies for pessimistic nuclear and optimistic coal, the reduction of the Fayette Project to 400MW and the reduction of STP to 300 MW and the inclusion of a new 250MW lignite supply in 1986 yielded about an \$11 million present worth advantage on this combination. He stated, however, that they were not confident of the plant or fuel costs for lignite. Mr. Hancock indicated that they would need to do some in depth studies on lignite before they could gain certain information. The next study represents a reduction in the STP

June 1, 1978

Project from its current 400MW level to 300 MW, which could bring it within its current borrowing authority, whereby the authority the city already has would complete Austin's obligation in the project. This on a present worth basis would cost the system about \$32 million extra. The final plan would entail retaining the Fayette Project at its current level and replacing the STP Project with a 400MW lignite unit in 1988, and the present cost of this being about \$76 million, under the pessimistic nuclear and optimistic coal criteria.

Mr. Hancock also made a cumulative cost breakdown of all costs related to the projects, indicating that this breakdown ignored the time value of money. He stated that the base plan in this type of analysis is the cheapest. The plan to reduce STP to within its current funding level from 400MW to 300MW will cost over the 15 year study period a cumulative \$137 million extra. The plan that deletes the STP Project and replaces it with a lignite facility in 1988 would cost a cumulative \$393 million over the 15 year study period as based on the pessimistic nuclear and the optimistic coal cost criteria. The plan to reduce Fayette to 400MW and to reduce the STP Project to 300MW bringing STP to within authority and reducing Fayette to the extent that very minimal additional funding would be required to take care of the transmission, distribution and street lighting in the system, but anticipating 250MW of lignite added to the system in 1986, would cost a cumulative extra \$40 million over the 15 year period. Mr. Hancock indicated that these costs take into consideration interests rates that would be incurred by the ratepayer.

Councilmember Himmelblau asked Mr. Hancock if he had the costs broken down into Kilowatts or as would apply to the ratepayer. Mr. Hancock stated that if, in 1983, STP, Fayette and Decker were generating the same amount of energy, that energy considering all costs exclusive of interests, would be 4¢ per KWH at Decker, 3.34¢ per KWH at Fayette and 2.2¢ per KWH at STP. He also gave a brief breakdown of energy costs in 1986. In response to a question from Councilmember Himmelblau, Mr. Hancock stated that they did not include the cost of scrubbers on many of the costs for the Fayette Project, but did for lignite units. Mr. Hancock pointed out that the lignite unit, in its first year of operation, would be more costly than the Fayette Project even though lignite fuel is cheaper because of cost escalations in the 1980's. He stated that lignite will eventually become a more economical facility some time in the 1990's. In response to a question from Councilmember Cooke, Mr. Hancock indicated that the decision to build a lignite facility for 1986 would probably have to be made in 1979. He indicated that they would be doing an assessment of some of the lignite resources being offered by LCRA. He felt that lignite was an attractive fuel source in spite of its lower quality, because, since lignite deposits are located in Texas, it would incur a minimum transportation cost. Mr. Hancock showed charts which indicated cost escalations for the various generating facilities during the 1980's.

In the Sensitivity studies, Mr. Hancock stated that for the Fayette coal fired plant, plant cost could increase 13% and fuel cost could increase 28% and the unit would still be economical under the pessimistic nuclear optimistic coal criteria. On the STP Project, given the pessimistic cost criteria the capital cost of the plant could escalate to \$331 million and still be an economic break even with the remainder of the system. Mr. Hancock stated that the fuel cost for STP could escalate to an additional 79% and the unit would still be an economic break even. He noted that uranium is only a portion of the fuel cost and consequently, uranium escalation is more than 79% of the \$75 per pound uranium. Mr. Hancock pointed out that the cost of uranium could increase from \$75/lb. to \$188/lb., and still be an economic break even. In response to a question from Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Mr. Hancock stated that at a cost of \$100/lb. of uranium, STP plant cost could escalate to \$301 million and still be an economic break even, assuming a

59% capacity factor. At the present plant cost, uranium could increase to as much as \$235/lb. and still be an economic break even. Conversely, if lignite is pegged at the \$75 used, the plant cost for STP could go up to \$331 million and it would still be economically attractive. Mr. Hancock stated the capacity factor for STP could decline to 45% and the unit would still be an economic break even, predicated upon a \$245 million plant cost and \$75/lb. of uranium.

Mr. Hancock presented a chart demonstrating projections of the costs in cents per Kilowatt Hour, by year under all of the alternative plans. Under the base plan, the current cost per KWH is about 4.6-4.7 cents per KWH and it will rise in 1979 as gas prices rise. With the implementation of coal it will level off. With the implementation of additional coal and some nuclear, it will begin to decline and then with full implementation of coal and nuclear it will bottom out at about 1983 at somewhere in the order of 4.2 cents per KWH, and then escalate thereafter in accordance with inflation rates. Mr. Hancock stated that if one is talking about a new facility, one escalates new plant costs and fuel costs. With a committed plan completed early on, plant cost is not escalated and this cost is not escalated and this cost can reach as high as 50-70% of the cost of energy in the area and if the national inflation rate is on the order of 7%, the escalation of energy cost then is about 3-4%. If this is deferred and the investment is made later then the escalation cost has to be paid on the plant cost. Mr. Hancock stated that the most economically attractive plan from a cumulative cost basis is the plan which reduces Fayette, reduces STP and adds 250MW of lignite. He stated that early on there would be a reduction in cost to the ratepayer and later on after about the middle '80's there would be an increase in cost to the ratepayer as one is paying the financing charges on the new lignite facilities. Finally, with implementation of the cheaper lignite fuel it would tend to pull the cost back down parallel to what the cost is under the base plan at that time. Mr. Hancock stated that another alternative would be to drop STP and add an equivalent capacity in lignite later. He stated that with the elimination of STP the cost of energy would become cheaper up until about 1981-82 and then the cost of energy becomes more expensive and there would be financing of additional capacity into the system through the 400MW lignite unit which will drive the cost up quite high until just prior to the lignite unit coming on-line at which time the cheap fuel will pull the price back down. Mr. Hancock stated that a 100MW reduction in STP would bring the project to within its current funding authority. As far as rates are concerned, with the base at zero, dropping STP at an additional cost of \$393 million, reducing STP and holding Fayette at an additional cost of \$137 million and reducing STP and adding 250MW of lignite in 1986 at a cost of \$40 million. This would be direct cumulative cost to the ratepayer. Expressed in terms of impact on the ratepayer, to remove STP and replace it with lignite will cost the ratepayer \$393 million which will save the 6.8% for the first three years, and will incur a penalty of 14% for the remaining 11 years in the period. Mr. Hancock stated that this pattern will probably continue on out even though they did not study beyond 1992. If STP is simply reduced to its current funding level, this will cumulatively cost the ratepayer a net of \$137 million. Ratepayers will have a 1.5% decrease for the first four years of the 15 year period and pay a 5.1% penalty for the remaining 11 yrs. in the period. If Fayette and STP are both reduced, and 250MW of lignite are added, the ratepayer will pay a \$40 million penalty which will be reflected in terms of a 3.2% reduction for the first years of the period and about a 2.6% increase for the remaining 10 years of the period.

(NOTE: Graphs, histograms and statistical data of the previous presentation are available in the City Clerk's Office.)

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED SITE DEVELOPMENT
ORDINANCE FOR THE LAKE AUSTIN WATERSHED

Mayor McClellan opened the public hearing scheduled for 11:00 A.M. on the proposed Site Development Ordinance for the Lake Austin Watershed. She said that she had received a letter from Mr. Mike Guerrero, who chairs the Planning Commission stating that they have not yet had time to give full consideration to this issue and ask that they have a chance to review the material and get back to Council by July 1. Councilmember Cooke said he thought Council should, after receiving testimony today, refer the ordinance to the Planning Commission for their input.

Dr. Maureen McReynolds, Director, Environmental Resource Management, appeared before Council to give a presentation on the proposed amendment to Chapter 29, the Lake Austin Interim Control. "During the discussions last fall and winter about the interim subdivision controls for Lake Austin Watershed, the Council requested that the staff develop an ordinance which addresses the water quality effect of developing all land, not just land going through the subdivision process. Development which would not be effected by the previous subdivision interim control would include any lot previously legally subdivided as well as the development of lots subdivided under the interim controls ordinance. That is, as proposed, this ordinance addresses development of any legal lot whether or not the lot was subdivided under the Lake Austin Ordinance. The Legal Department has determined that the most logical place to address interim control regulations to deal with land that is not being subdivided is in Chapter 29 of the City Code. This chapter deals with waterways and drainage and contains the provisions of the Creek Ordinance, which addresses drainage alteration, that is water quantity. Thus, the ordinance amendments that are the subject of today's public hearing, incorporate the Lake Austin interim controls which the Council previously approved into Chapter 29 in the creek permit process. The language of both that previous ordinance and the creek ordinance in many places has been modified in the current proposal in order that it will be more readable. Also the organization of materials is different from what you saw in Chapter 41, the Subdivision Ordinance. There are some significant differences in the two Interim Control Ordinances. These are primarily due to the nature of the permit process versus the subdivision process.

"The first important point is that a special development permit is required within the Lake Austin Watershed. An exemption from this permit is allowed for the development of a single family lot or a duplex. If that development meets the impervious cover standards of the ordinance, the process we envision here is that the engineering department would review a simple site drawing of single family or duplex construction for the impervious cover requirement. If this standard is met, essentially the same process they now follow under the current Creek Permit process would occur. Which is, they would get an exempt permit. If they do not meet the impervious cover standards they would either modify their application or go through the rest of the process, but the review of these developments will now include the land located within the Lake Austin Watershed, but outside the city limits.

"The information required, as listed on page 2 and 3 of the proposed ordinance in general tracks the information which the applicant is required to submit under the Creek Ordinance process, and the previous Lake Austin Subdivision Ordinance. But in many cases where under the subdivision ordinance there was a request for generalized descriptions and general information under the site development ordinance, detailed descriptions are required because now we are dealing with actual construction on the site.

"Page 4, special requirements, follow those provisions included in the original ordinance. Paved surfaces, as addressed in this ordinance is used as a general term rather than roadways which would be used under the subdivision ordinance. Under the Subdivision Ordinance most roadways and streets are dedicated through that process, therefore, roads are specifically addressed in that ordinance. In the Site Development Ordinance the majority of impervious coverage will include parking areas, etc. and not specifically roadways.

"On page 5, following the requirement included in the Lake Austin Subdivision Interim Controls, a site disturbance discussion...one thing that has been eliminated from this that's in the Lake Austin Subdivision Ordinance is reference to a minimum building size. This was eliminated since it is anticipated that many of the existing legal lots may be very small and the minimum building size of 3,000 square feet may not be achievable for those existing legal lots. And the rest of the section is basically the same.

" There is one significant difference in the impervious coverage section, which is section (c) on page 5. That is that the transfer provision is increased to 80% as in the approved subdivision control there is 30% allowable impervious cover on slopes less than 15%; 20% on slopes between 15% and 25%; and 10% on slopes over 25%. In the subdivision ordinance an additional transfer is allowed of.....impervious cover allowed on steep slopes can be transferred to the 0-15% class, up to a total of 40%. In this ordinance, the Environmental Board recommended that be increased because we'll be dealing primarily with commercial development, such as shopping centers or apartment complexes, where a larger impervious cover is anticipated. Therefore, they recommended 80% to be the maximum allowable transfer provision. The second paragraph on page 5 under impervious cover deals with land that is subdivided according to the Lake Austin Interim Ordinance regulations."

Mayor McClellan said she did not think Council would act on this issue today because of the Planning Commission request and asked Ms. McReynolds to provide Council with a written memo highlighting the differences between the two ordinances, and the information she has been giving today.

Ms. McReynolds continued to highlight the differences and pointed out where it has been re-written and re-worded for clarity. When she finished her report, Councilmember Cooke asked if "we could get some kind of any initial perspectives from engineering and environmental on any results they might have however preliminary on the initial Lake Austin interim ordinance with regard to what the status is and how they perceive it at this time in talking about monitoring and things like that."

Mr. Charles B. Graves, Director of Engineering, said, "The biggest gains have been in the frequent sessions we've had with developers and with their consultants in finding new ways to do things. I think that's very significant. Right now we're just beginning to develop a process to allow us to move forward on this. Monitoring is still a problem when we think in terms of the specific site because how and when do we sample. Looking at the area on the whole, monitoring is not too big a problem because we can test for trends and the success of our ordinance and we can see whether we are degrading or improving the quality."

Mr. Davidson, City Manager, told Mr. Cooke that he would submit a written report to Council answering his questions so that he could also include some perspectives of about two other departments. Councilmember Goodman asked that, included in the report, there should be information concerning what per-

spectives of about two other departments. Councilmember Goodman asked that, included in the report, there should be information concerning what percentage are coming in under alternative methods, versus standard provisions of the ordinance. Mr. Lillie, Director of Planning stated, "All of the subdivisions are meeting the ordinance standards to this point. None at this point are coming in under the alternative methods. We have one subdivision that is currently being reviewed...Great Hills, that has large commercial tracts, that we probably will be looking at the alternative methods on, but it's the first one. I'll get you the numbers of lots and the names of subdivisions with Mr. Davidson's report."

Mr. KEN MANNING, speaking on behalf of the Austin Regional Group of the Sierra Club, appeared before Council. He said that he thought, as Dr. McReynolds described, there is very little difference between the proposed Site Development Ordinance for the Lake Austin Watershed, and the Subdivision Ordinance. He said he thinks the most significant thing about the ordinance is that it applies a permitting procedure within the city's ETJ and outside of the city's limits. And that, he said is the kind of innovative thing the city needs to be doing. The 80% impervious cover being allowed as a maximum under the transfer provision, he said, is perhaps a bit high, but feels the impact of that provision would be to require that commercial and retail developers leave a certain amount of open space in their developments. Mr. Manning said he is also concerned about the timing...something that got hashed out late in the process on the subdivision ordinance. He said that was what kind of provisions will be made for a grandfather clause. He does not anticipate, he said, that the Planning Commission will come up with significant provisions for what is being proposed here. The sub-committee of the Commission has been involved in deliberations and they do not really have significant problems with it. But he said, they are going to take a while to come up with their recommendations and then it's going to have to come back to Council. He said that Dr. McReynold's estimate that it would come back by July 1 is optimistic because of the C.I.P. going on. After deliberation on this point, the following motion was made:

Motion

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council ~~close~~ the public hearing and send the proposed Site Development Ordinance for the Lake Austin Watershed back to the Planning Commission for consideration on June 13, and send back to Council as soon as possible. The motion, seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, carried by the following motion.

Ayes: Councilmembers ~~Cooke~~, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen,
Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan
Noes: None

NEW BUDGET FORMAT

Mr. Daron Butler, Budget Director, appeared before Council to discuss the new budget format. Mayor McClellan said, "This being a year of re-evaluation of property, we want to devise a budget which will provide the needed services but at a cost we can afford. The Council has in its Goals and Priorities in the year 79-80 moving toward zero based budgeting and cost accounting. However, we're taking some steps with this new budget toward that."

Mr. Butler said that by taking into consideration comments made by Council concerning the previous budget format there are two important changes

in the process and format which are being applied this year. One is the emphasis on work program data. In February, he said, they began working with departments to improve the performance indicators used in the budget. Their goal is to move away from indicators that describe activity, such as miles of street paved and water pumped and number of arrests, to indicators that measure performance in terms of efficiency and work costs and unit cost data where possible. And in terms of effectiveness, they are trying to measure it as performance related to the stated goals and objectives of the department. I don't think, he said, that you will see every performance indicator in the budget changed this around, but there will be changes in many of the performance indicators that were used during last year's budget process. He said that this is a significant undertaking by the City Manager's office, the budget staff and the departments which will take some time to change all of the indicators. Mr. Butler continued that staff has reviewed zero based budgeting both in its theory and its impact. They looked particularly at the experience of San Antonio and reviewed some municipalities also. Based upon that review, they decided that within the format and process being used this year there are two specific aspects of zero based budgeting which they can implement immediately at no cost and by using their own staff. He said that is the way they define the basic budget and the way they present requests for additional spending to Council in future years. Mr. Butler explained, by use of slides the modified version of zero based budgeting which is currently being used.

Councilmember Himmelblau questioned "Didn't we have a policy that we would have the proposed budget earlier?" Mr. Davidson answered, "We had a policy to do that when we were still operating under the previous format, but to be very honest with you we've asked all the city departments to totally change the way they submit the budget. The Research and Budget staff has had to re-organize in order to comprehend all of the requests and put those in some meaningful order. We are talking about a massive print job this year in order to do the kind of job I think the Council wants done. We can try to speed this up but we hope the proposed schedule will be acceptable because I don't think the Council has ever scheduled any work sessions or public hearings prior to about two weeks after the 8th of August and therefore you would have this material about two weeks before you started working on the actual budget. If it's possible to speed it up we certainly would want to do it."

Councilmember Cooke asked for the projected time schedule regarding presentation of the C.I.P. Mr. Butler said the budget department plans to deliver it to Council on or about July 19th. The Mayor and City Manager thanked Mr. Butler for his report.

PLANNING AND DESIGN STUDIES TO UPGRADE A PORTION OF U.S. 183

Mayor Pro Tem Mullen presented to Council a request for the Austin Transportation Study and the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation to initiate planning and design studies and advance the construction schedule for improving U.S. 183/S.H. 71 Interchange, in the form of a resolution.

He asked Council to approve the resolution and move up the necessary funds in the C.I.P. to accomplish this. He said about \$750,000 has been projected over the next five years and it would just be moved up in earlier years.

Motion

Mayor Pro Tem Mullen moved that the Council adopt a resolution to formally request that the Austin Transportation Study and the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation initiate planning and design studies and advance the construction schedule for upgrading U.S. Highway 183 to expressway standards from Farm-to-Market 620 to State Highway 71; and to move up the necessary funds in the C.I.P. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Goodman.

In seconding the motion, Councilmember Goodman asked the City Manager if these bond monies are now available. Mr. Davidson, City Manager, asked Mr. Reed, Deputy City Manager to reply to this, but commented that if this is approved, staff will come back with the necessary appropriations at the next Council meeting. Mr. Reed stated: "They would be in the proposed C.I.P. and part of them would be subject to the future bond election." He said he did not have the exact amount of funds available. Mr. Cooke asked what particular project this is addressed to and what particular funding years they would be pulling up. Councilmember Goodman asked what the impact would be. Mr. Mullen answered, "The projects are the Burnet Road railroad track area which was projected for 79-80 be used in 78-79. The 183 MoPac Loop 360 are which was in 81-82, that would be moved up a year, and the 620 to 360 has \$250,000 in there just for various intersections, and that would be moved up." He said that the State will pick up 90% of the tab on intersections and all the construction costs, so, he said the city would pay 1% of the total project.

Roll Call On Motion

Ayes: Councilmembers Goodman, Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmember Cooke
Noes: None

ELIMINATION OF FACADE EASEMENT FEE

Councilmember Cooke proposed to Council that they consider eliminating the license application fee and the annual fee for facade easements. He said that this would indicate to people who want to make modifications with regard to facade easements, the Council's intent to cooperate. He said the budget impact in the past 3 or 4 years has only been about \$200.00. He said he would also like to delete the license and application fee for landscaping in order to beautify the area in front of stores or businesses.

Councilmember Trevino agreed with the proposal and said he thinks it unfair to talk about city beautification and then when individuals do so at their own expense, the city, in essence, rents the space to them in order that they might add landscaping.

Motion

Councilmember Cooke moved that the Council approve the elimination of the license application fee and the annual fee for facade easements, and deleted license and application fee for landscaping. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers

Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman
Noes: None

EXECUTIVE SESSION RECESS

Council recessed at 12:30 for a short Executive Session as announced at the beginning of this meeting by Mayor McClellan, and returned to Council Chamber to announce Board and Commission appointments.

BOARD & COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

The Council approved the following Board and Commission appointments:

Planning Commission

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council approve the reappointment of Sally Shipman, Reverend Freddie Dixon, Bill Stoll, and Leopold Danze, to the Planning Commission for terms expiring June 1, 1980. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman
Noes: None

Human Relations Commission

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council approve the appointment of Ms. Eunice Wyatt to a term on the Human Relations Commission, to expire November 1, 1978. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman
Noes: None

Building Code Board of Appeals

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council approve the appointment of William McFarland to a term on the Building Code Board Of Appeals. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman
Noes: None

City Board of Natural Resources and Environmental Quality

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council approve the appointment of William L. Cepeda to a term on the City Board of Natural Resources and Environmental Quality, expiring July 1, 1979. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman

Noes: None

Vending Commission

Councilmember Goodman moved that the Council approve the appointments of Joe E. McAdams, Scott Lyford, Diane Foshee, and Virginia Lang Smith to terms on the Vending Commission ending June 1, 1980. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmember Himmelblau, Mayor Pro Tem Mullen, Councilmembers Snell, Trevino, Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman
Noes: None

MEETING ADJOURNED

The Meeting of the Council was adjourned at 1:00 P.M.

APPROVED

Carole Keeton McClellan
Mayor

ATTEST:

Grace Monroe
City Clerk